

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/449,782	MCKEETH, JAMES	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mary J. Steelman	2191	

All Participants:
Status of Application: pending

 (1) Mary J. Steelman.

(3) _____.

 (2) Dan C. Hu, Reg. No. 40,025.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 August 2006
Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

8-28-06

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner attempted to clarify the claim limitations: "wherein the command line utility is a utility executable from a command line prompt". Mr. Hu said it meant that a command line utility was 'capable of executing from a command line prompt'. The discussion failed to clarify for Examiner whether claims are drawn to a command line utility entered at a command line prompt, provided in a shell terminal interface or some other type of user interface..